SHORT

# Animadversions

UPON A

# SERMON

Lately Preached

By the Reverend Dr. *TILLOTSON*,

UPON

*JOSHUA* 24. 15. And since Published.

So far as the said *SERMON* asserteth the *Power* of the Magistrate in things of *Religion* over his *Subjects*, the same with that of the *Master of a Family* over his Family.

The *unlawfulness* of *Preaching* the *true Religion* by Ministers, where a *false Religion* is established by *Law*, without an extraordinary *Commission confirmed by Miracles*; and the *Hypocrisie* of such *Ministers* as think themselves obliged to *Preach Christ* (though contrary to a *Law*) in their own *Country*, because they do not go and do the same in *Turky* or *Spain*.

All which *Assertions* are shortly Examined. The first proved to be *uncertainly true*. The second *condemning* the *Practice* of all the *first Ministers of the Gospel, after the Apostles*, and of those that have *laboured in Reformation*. The third *most uncharitable*, and *groundless*.

---

*LONDON:* Printed in the Year 1680.

# *Some ſhort* Animadverſions *upon part of a* Sermon *lately publiſhed, being Preached by Dr.* Tillotſon *upon* Joſhua 24. 15.

WHO ſo conſidereth what *Myſteries* of the moſt horrid *Villanies* that ever came to light in any age, acted by a *Popiſh party* in our *Nation*, have come to light amongſt us within theſe two laſt years; and that a *cloſe purſuit* of thoſe *Villains* who were the contrivers of them, hath taken up much of the time of our *Courts of Juſtice*; cannot but think that Party and their friends highly concerned to vindicate their pretended *Catholick Religion* from ſuch *imputations*, and to find our *Magiſtrates* ſome other work to do, and to *divert* the *diſcourſes* of people from the *Popiſh Plot*. Many attempts have been made to impoſe upon people, that it was no *Popiſh*, but a *Presbyterian Plot*. And a *common Scribler* hath attempted, under pretence of a *further diſcovery of the Plot*, to give *Diſſenters* the far *greater ſhare* in it. It hath pleaſed God ſtrangely to defeat theſe *Achitophels*, and to ſuffer themſelves to fall in the pit they had digged for others—*Nec lex eſt juſtior ulla.* For the *Diverſion* of the *Sword of Juſtice*, it hath been thought reaſonable to attempt the turning the *Edg* of it againſt perſons that are *Proteſtants*, to ſet *Magiſtrates* on work to execute thoſe Laws which were *principally* and *prima-*

*rily* intended againſt *Papiſts*, upon *Proteſtants* that diſſented in ſome matters of *Worſhip* and *Diſcipline*; to which they have found an advantage from ſome *general words* in them. But ſuch is the candor of *Engliſh ſpirits*, that it was neceſſary firſt, That people ſhould be poſſeſſed that ſuch *ſeverities* were *lawful*, and what the *Magiſtrates* might with a good conſcience uſe; and that the *perſons* were in ſome high degree *criminals*. If what a *Son of the Church*, in one of the moſt famous Auditories of *England* (in a diſcourſe called, *Curſe ye Meroz*) hath ſaid be true, they are *criminal enough*; and whether thoſe things be true or no, if what another learned *Dean* hath ſaid in his *Sermon* lately on *Joſhua* 24. 15. *That the Magiſtrate, in matters of Religion, hath the ſame power over his Subjects, that a Maſter of a family hath over his children or ſervants*; the Magiſtrate is warranted. And though I am far from thinking, that the latter of theſe deſigned to *incourage* a *perſecution of Proteſtants*, and that at ſuch a time, when it is the moſt adviſable project for the *Popiſh deſign* imaginable; and that partly becauſe himſelf will proteſt againſt it, he hath appeared to the world ſuch an *eminent aſſertor* of the true Religion againſt Popery; and as he is a man of judgment and learning above thouſands of others; ſo he hath always appeared a man of temper, and exceeding great moderation; yet whether he hath not beyond his intention ſerved this deſign, may deſerve his own ſerious *Reflections*.

I am far from the baſe diſingenuity of thoſe who can ſee nothing good in their Adverſaries; ſo that though I take my ſelf obliged to enter my diſſent to ſome things which Dr. *Tillotſon* hath ſaid in his late printed Sermon concerning the *Power of the Magiſtrate* in matters of Religion, and the *force of ſome humane Laws* prohibiting men to Preach the Goſpel, *&c.* Yet I am ſo far pleaſed with

with the reſt of the diſcourſe, that I do for my ſelf, and I dare venture in the name of all *Diſſenters*, to give him thanks for what he hath ſaid in it in defence of the *Proteſtant Religion* (that *Hogen Mogen* thing, as a late Dialogiſt, who would be thought a Proteſtant, is pleaſed to call it); and to aver, That if there were no more ſaid by any in the world to *loath people* of that Religion, and make it an abhorrence to all good Princes, and all good men, than he hath ſaid in 13 or 14 lines, page 31. nor any more ſaid than he hath ſaid to baffle their *Popiſh* Arguments from *Univerſality* and *Antiquity*; yet there needed no more: for all the *Papiſts* on the Earth can never either *wipe* off the firſt, or anſwer the latter. All that I have to enter my diſſent unto, lies in *five pages*, viz. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. nor ſhould I have done it, as to any thing in them, if I had not judged, That by ſome *aſſertions* in them, the *Magiſtrate* is warranted, if not in the *ſlaying*, yet in the *baniſhment* or ſevere *puniſhing* of his *Subjects diſſenting*, not in the *eſſentials* of Religion, but only in the *circumſtantials*; yet ſuch as *in the doing*, or *not doing* of them aright, the ſoul may become guilty before God. And alſo, that by thoſe *aſſertions*, whoſoever ſucceeded the Apoſtles in the firſt *Plantation of the Goſpel*, in Countreys where a falſe Religion was before eſtabliſhed by a Law, and all thoſe glorious *Martyrs* who have ſuffered for publiſhing the Goſpel in *England*, while *Popery* was here eſtabliſhed by Law, or in other Countreys: and ſo all the firſt *Reformers* are moſt inconſiderately condemned, as doing that they had no right, no authority to do; and all thoſe Divines condemned for *Hypocrites*, who take themſelves bound in their native Countrey, and to their neighbourhood, under a neceſſity to preach the Goſpel, and cannot think that they have an equal obligation upon them to traverſe the World, to make the Goſpel to

abound

abound from *London* to *Constantinople*, *Rome* or *Madrid*.

The *Doctors* discourse would have been much clearer, if he had pleased in any part of it to have opened his mind to us as to these three things:

1. What is that which he calls a *true*, or *false Religion*? He doth not make the term *Religion* convertible with *Christianity*; for he saith *p.* 29. *That the Papists retain the Essentials of Christianity*, yet he chargeth them with a *false Religion*; for he truly saith, *That our Church ever since the beginning of Christianity hath charged them with Idolatry*; So that by a *false Religion* the *Doctor* must mean an *undue worshipping of God*, I think.

2. I could have wished the *Doctor* had as clearly told us, whom he meaneth by the *Magistrate*. For those in whom alone resides the *Legislative power* of a Nation, are Magistrates, though when the Laws are made they do not *execute them*. 2. Those who have no share in the *Legislative power*, but to whom the *execution* of Laws made is committed, are also *Magistrates*. 3. He or they who hath or have a share in the *Legislation*, and the *executive* power, to execute Laws made, is a Magistrate. 4. *He who alone without advising with others, or their concurrence or assent*, can make Laws, and then *execute* or *command* the *execution* of them, is a *Magistrate* also. Now the last of these undoubtedly hath the greatest power. The first hath next to him the greatest power. The second and third have only a power to execute Laws made.

3. It also had been to have been wished that the Doctor had clearly told us, who (as to particular persons practice) is to *judg* whether a *Religion* be *true* or *false*; he seems to judg truly, that every particular Christian hath his *judgment of discretion* in the case, for he seems to plead for a Christians liberty of *private practice*, who *thinketh*, or *judgeth* himself to be in the right, *p.* 12.

I much

I much abhor the mis-representation of an *Adversary*. I shall *verbatim* transcribe what this learned Author saith, and fairly tell him wherein I agree, or not agree with him, and for what *Reasons* it is that I cannot so agree. The learned Authors words are these, *p.* 9, *&c.* "To coun-
"tenance and support the true Religion, and to take care
"that the people be instructed in it, and to take care that
"none be permitted to debauch and seduce men from it,
"properly belongs to the Civil Magistrate. This power
"the Kings of *Israel* always exercised; and that not on-
"ly with allowance, but with great approbation and
"commendation from God himself; and the case is not
"altered since Christianity: The better the Religion is,
"the better it deserveth the countenance and support of
"the Civil Authority.

All this is a very great truth; if by the *true Religion* our Author means *that way of worshipping God, which God hath in his word directed, without any addition thereto, or diminution therefrom.* It is very true, that the *Kings of Israel*, by Gods command, allowance, and with Gods approbation and high commendation, did exercise such a power, and no other power than this; and all sober persons will grant the same under the *New Testament* to all *Magistrates* that are themselves *Christians*, as the Kings of *Israel* were *Israelites*; but if the Doctor comprehends any thing more than this (as to things to be done) under the notion of the *true Religion*, he saith nothing to prove it. He goes on.

*And this power of the Civil Magistrate in matters of Religion, was never called in question by any, but by the Enthusiasts of these latter times.*

It is true, some *Enthusiasts* have called this power in question; but neither *Presbyterians* nor *Independents*, nor the hundredth part of Dissenters in *England* question it. He goes on. *And*

*And yet amongſt theſe, every Father and Maſter of a Family claimeth this power over his children and ſervants at the ſame time that they deny it to the Magiſtrate over his Subjects.*

What power do they claim? that power which the Kings of *Iſrael* had; that is, *to require thoſe under their government, to worſhip God according to his revealed will?* Who are they that deny this power to the Magiſtrate, unleſs ſome few and inconſiderable perſons? The generality of Diſſenters are quite of another mind. The Doctor goes on.

"But I would fain know where the difference lyes: "Hath a Maſter of a family more power over thoſe un- "der his government, than the Magiſtrate hath? No "man ever pretended it; nay ſo far is it from that, that "the natural authority of a Father, may, and often is re- "ſtrained by the Law of the Civil Magiſtrate. And why "then may not a Magiſtrate exerciſe the ſame power over "his Subjects in matters of Religion, which every Maſter "challengeth to himſelf in his own family, that is, to "eſtabliſh the true worſhip of God in ſuch manner, and "with ſuch circumſtances as he thinks beſt, and to ſuffer "none to affront it, or to ſeduce thoſe from it that are "under his care? And to prevent all miſ-underſtandings "in this matter, I do not aſcribe any thing unto the Ma- "giſtrate, that can poſſibly give him any pretence of right "to reject the true Religion, or to declare what he plea- "ſeth to be ſo, and what books he pleaſeth to be Cano- "nical, and the Word of God; and conſequently to make "a falſe Religion ſo currant by the ſtamp of his Autho- "rity, or to oblige his Subjects to the profeſſion of it; "becauſe he who acknowledgeth to derive his Authority "from God, can pretend to none againſt him.

Here

Here the *Doctor* ingenuously and truly grants, that *no Magistrate hath, or can have any power or authority to establish a false Religion* (that is, a false way of worshipping God, or a false faith), or to oblige his Subjects to the profession of it; he proves it undeniably: Nor hath any Parent or Master such a power. That he hath a power to oblige his Subjects to the profession of the true Religion, there's none that I know will deny. But here now the question ariseth, Who shall judg whether the *Doctrines* to be believed, and to which the *Inferiours assent* is required, or the *way of worship* commanded by the *Superiour* to be used by the *Inferiour*, be *true* or *false*? If he saith the *Magistrate*, then the Magistrate may establish a *false Religion*, for he establisheth it as *believing it to be true*. Shall the *Inferiour be judg*? then the Magistrate hath no *power* over him; for he cannot (saith the Doctor) *oblige his Subjects* to profess a *false Religion*.

The Doctor here maketh the power of the *Magistrate* over his *Subjects*, to be the same with the power of a *Master* over his *Servants*, or a *Father* over his *Children*. He asks *who ever denied it*? I ask who ever affirmed it, without saying *what servants*, and what he meaneth, and as to what things? Doth he mean a *Jewish Servant*, or Master? the *Jewish* Master had a power over his *Servant*, which surely none will assert the Magistrate to have over his Subjects; besides, the *Jews* had *bond-servants*, and *hired-servants*, and their power was different as to them. Doth he mean a *Romish servant*, or *slave*, who hath been taken in War, and redeemed his life by servitude? The *Romans* might at their pleasure *kill* such *servants*. It is true, the Law of God (as to which probably the Doctor speaks) gave them no such power; but undoubtedly the *Law of God* allows a different power to *Masters*, as to *different servants*. As to *things*; the Doctor at first delivered him-

ſelf *generally. Hath the Maſter of a family more power over thoſe under his government than the Magiſtrate hath?* yes ſure. But repeating it again, he ſaith no more. *That he may exerciſe the ſame power over his Subjects in matters of Religion.* I am clearly of his mind: but what is that? The *Doctor* tells us, *He may eſtabliſh the true worſhip of God in ſuch manner, and with ſuch circumſtances as he thinks beſt; and permit none to affront it, or to ſeduce thoſe from it that are under his care*; that is, *he may command thoſe things to be done in the worſhip of God, which God hath commanded* (that is, true Religion); and under ſuch *circumſtances* as are either neceſſary to all humane actions, (which muſt have time and place), or as are neceſſary to ſo grave an action, that it may not be performed in a manner which to all ſhall appear rude and indecent. All this will be freely granted, both to the *Maſter* of a family, and to a *Magiſtrate.* But ſtill the queſtion is, *Who ſhall be judg what thoſe things are that God hath commanded in his worſhip*; if the *Magiſtrate* or *Maſter* by Gods Law be the judg of the thing as to the Inferiours practice, they may command a falſe Religion.

And another queſtion is here, What *coercive power the Magiſtrate or Maſter hath in the Cauſe, from the law of God?* If the Servant refuſeth, the *Maſter* may baniſh his ſervant out of his houſe. May the Magiſtrate baniſh Diſſenters from his Eſtabliſhment, out of his Kingdom? The Maſter of a family, in caſe his ſervant cannot agree with the Religious order of his family, cannot *impriſon* him, nor *take away his money*, nor his *lands and houſes* by any Law of *God* or *man*; he may rid his houſe of him, or take away his imployment from him: So for ought I know may a *Magiſtrate* deprive ſuch a perſon of any *office* or truſt he holdeth under him, he may expel him his Court: but what can he do more, allowing him the ſame power in mat-

matters of Religion over his Subjects, which a Master hath over his Servants? I cannot tell; but if he hath such a power over his Subjects in *things of Religion*, he hath it *much more* in *civil things*, for they are his *proper sphere*, matters which belong to him as he is a *Magistrate*. Magistrates have no power from Gods Word in matters of Religion, but as *Christian* or *Religious Magistrates*. The *Jewish* Magistrates were members of the *Jewish* Church; I never read of any such power over the *Israelites*, granted by God to *Pharaoh* or *Nebuchadnezzar*, or any of the *Kings* of *Babylon*, nor any obligation laid upon the *Israelites* to be obedient to their *Edicts* in things of Religion; the Magistrate therefore cannot have so much power over a people in matters of Religion, as in the things of this life; and if his power in matters of Religion over his Subjects be *despotical*, and the same with that of the *Master of a family* over his *servants*, it must *a fortiori*, hold as to all Civil things.

The power of a Parent is partly *natural*, as the Parent is the immediate cause of the childs being. Partly *moral*, as the child is *fed* at the parents table, and clothed by him. Again, Children are to be considered in their *Nonage*, before they come to the exercise of their Reason; or at their *mature age*, when they are able to use their reason. For children during their *Nonage*, Parents doubtless have an absolute power of commanding them as they please (so 'tis reasonable Magistrates should have over *Lunaticks*, *Ideots*, and *Children* left to no care of Governours). But if we consider children at *mature age*, they are to *judg* for themselves. In matters of Religion parents may advise and command, but the child is bound to obey no further than he apprehendeth, that what his parents advise and command is not contrary to the Law of God. They have *power* to punish for *disobedience*, but how far?

not by death, or impriſonment, or taking away the childrens eſtate, procured by their own induſtry, or given them by friends; they may turn their children out of their family, and diſinherit them, and leave it to Gods judgment at the laſt day, whether they have dealt juſtly or no; for God hath commanded them not to *provoke their children to wrath*, and they owe their children *juſtice* as well as their *neighbour*, and poſſibly more *equity* than their ordinary neighbours. This power is again granted to the *Magiſtrate*, and we wiſh that he would pleaſe thus to circumſcribe his power.

But yet becauſe the Doctor asks where is the *difference betwixt the Magiſtrate and the Maſter of a family?* I will ſhew him.

The power of a *Maſter over his ſervant, ariſeth from an explicit covenant or contract which his ſervant hath made with him.* The power of a *Father ariſeth from his natural relation to his ſon, and cauſation in his production*; and from the *proviſion of food and rayment* which he maketh for him; ſo the latter is partly *natural*, partly *moral*. How cometh a Maſter to have power over his ſervant, but from an *explicit contract* or *covenant* which he hath made with him, That in conſideration of his teaching him ſuch a *myſtery, craft* or *occupation*, of his giving him ſuch *wages*, finding him *meat, drink or clothes*, he will do *ſuch and ſuch work* for him for ſuch a time? *&c.* and both the *Maſters* power of commanding, and the ſervants duty in *obeying*, is limited by the terms of this *Covenant*; always provided, that he cannot ſin againſt God by *diſobeying* his Maſter in any thing he commands him to do, which is ſinful, though he did raſhly covenant to do it; for none in obeying God before man, can ſin againſt God.

The power of a Parent ariſeth, as I ſaid before, either from his *natural ſuperiority* to the child, and *cauſation* as

to

to his being, or from his providing meat, drink and rayment for him.

The *Magiſtrates power* is founded in the *Law*; he was no cauſe of *being to his Subjects*; he doth not provide them *food* or *rayment*, nor give them *wages*; they have not ſeverally *covenanted with him*. But the *Nation* of which they are members, have choſen ſuch a perſon, or the deſcendants of ſuch a line, or family, and agreed that he, or they, ſhall be their *Governours to execute ſuch or ſuch Laws*, or to *make them Laws*, &c. (if the tenour of the Government be ſuch). Hence ariſeth his power to command, their duty to obey: which can reach to nothing which God hath forbidden them, becauſe he is higher than the higheſt; but reacheth to all things in Religion which God hath particularly commanded; and yet more fully to all *civil things*, according to the tenour of the Laws of the Nation. This makes one great difference, I think to name no more. But now the queſtion is, what the *Subject* muſt do in caſe a *falſe Religion* be eſtabliſhed by Law, or commanded by the Superiour? let us go on with what the Doctor ſaith, *p.* 11. "But if "a falſe Religion be eſtabliſhed by Law, the caſe here is "the ſame, as in all other Laws that are ſinful in the mat- "ter of them, but yet made by a lawful authority. In "this caſe the Subject is not bound to profeſs a falſe Re- "ligion, but patiently to ſuffer for the profeſſion of the "true. And to ſpeak freely in this matter, I cannot "think, till I be better informed (which I am always "ready to be) that any pretence of conſcience can war- "rant any man that is not extraordinarily commiſſioned "as the Apoſtles and firſt Publiſhers of the Goſpel were, "and cannot juſtifie thir commiſſion by Miracles, as they "did, to *affront* the eſtabliſhed Religion of a Nation, "though it be *falſe*, and openly to draw men off from "the

" the profeſſion of it, *in contempt* of the Magiſtrate and " the Laws. All that perſons of a different Religion can " in ſuch a caſe reaſonably pretend to, is to enjoy the " private liberty and exerciſe of their own Religion and " Conſcience, and to forbear the open making of Proſe- " lytes to their own Religion (*though they be never ſo ſure* " *they are in the right*) till they either have an extraor- " dinary commiſſion from God to that purpoſe, or the " Providence of God makes a way for it by the permiſſi- " on of the Magiſtrate.

The *Doctor*, like a very ingenuous man, aſſerts this only *until he be better informed, and aſſureth us he is always ready ſo to be.* Therefore (*Pace tanti viri*) with the good leave of ſo great a perſon firſt asked, I crave leave to inform him,

1. That if he interprets the term [*affront*] by drawing men off from the profeſſion of a falſe Religion, by ſhewing them the Errors of it, and declaring the way of God to them; if he calls all Preaching of the Goſpel in ſuch caſes a *contempt* of the Magiſtrate and the Law, let it be done never ſo *modeſtly* and *meekly*, without any *rude reflections*, Wiſe and learned men do think that he hath here *condemned* all the ancient *Fathers* and Miniſters of the Goſpel, who ſucceeded the Apoſtles till *Conſtantines* time, for 300 years after Chriſt, and had no extraordinary commiſſion, which we ever read they confirmed by miracles, for doing what they had *no pretence of conſcience for doing*, which could warrant them. Did not they thus far affront the *falſe Religion* of the Heathens eſtabliſhed by *humane Laws*, in contempt of ſuch Laws and Magiſtrates? did they not loſe their lives in Preaching the Goſpel contrary to ſuch Laws? did they forbear the open making of Proſelytes to their Religion, till they had ſuch a commiſſion from God, or permiſſion from the *Pagan Magi-*

*Magiſtrates?* where then had Chriſtianity been this day in the world? Will the Doctor ſay, That theſe Magiſtrates being no members of the Church, had no power to command in matters of Religion? I muſt confeſs I think ſo; but then what needed the Apoſtles any *extraordinary commiſſion*, or *miracles* to juſtifie them?

2. Let me crave leave to inform the Doctor, *That this aſſertion* condemneth all the Divines amongſt the *Albigenſes* and *Waldenſes*, *John Huſs*, and *Hierome of Prague*, *Wickliff*, and many more in *England*. *Luther* and *Zuinglius*, and all the firſt Reformers in *Germany* and *France*, as doing that *which no pretence of conſcience could warrant* in their *Preachings* and their *Reformation*. There was a *falſe Religion eſtabliſhed* by law in *Germany*, *France*, *Savoy*, *England*; yet theſe great men did not keep to a private exerciſe of their Religion, but openly Preached the Goſpel, and endeavoured to *Proſelyte* men from *Popery*; yet never were able by one *miracle* to confirm their extraordinary *commiſſion*, nor had the Supreme Magiſtrates permiſſion in moſt places where they preached; many of them dyed *Martyrs* in this Cauſe, the reſt are dead. *Died they all as fools died?* What could the *Papiſts* ever ſay more to defame our Religion by, or with? what have all our Divines done hitherto in pleading in the defence of what they did?

3. I crave leave to inform the Doctor, That this notion will *Rivet* and *confirm Popery*, yea *Paganiſm in any Nation under Heaven, where either of them doth obtain by a law, or ſhall hereafter obtain:* It muſt be the will of God, (according to this aſſertion) that ſuch a people ſhould never hear of Chriſt, nor have the ordinary means of ſalvation made known to them.

I profeſs I do not write theſe things without trembling: Muſt we then renounce our *Chriſtianity*, or our *Proteſtant Reli-*

*Religion?* or leave our ſelves no plea for keeping either, but that of *Fiere non debuit factum valet.* Chriſtianity at firſt, and the *Religion of Proteſtants*, was brought in and propagated irregularly, without any *pretence of conſcience to warrant thoſe that did it*; but now it is protected by a Law, it is the beſt *Religion in the world*, and we ought to keep it; but we muſt do ſo no more. If *Paganiſm* or *Popery* ſtand by Law in any place, no man muſt preach the Goſpel, or the *Proteſtant Doctrine* in that place, but be content with the private liberty and exerciſe of his own Conſcience.

I have two great things to ſay againſt this *Aſſertion*:

1. It is eminently againſt *piety* towards God.
2. It is as much againſt *charity* towards men.

1. *Piety* lyeth much in our *predication*, and *manifeſting the name of God unto men in the world.* And,

2. *In obeying thoſe precepts of his, which more immediately tend to this homage.* The glory of God is the very end of our *Creation*, the end which we ought to aim at in all our actions. We can add nothing to the *eſſential glory of God*; nor other way glorifie him, than by *manifeſting his name*, and *doing his will. I have* (ſaith Chriſt, *Joh.* 17.46.) *glorified thee on earth.* How was this? *I have finiſhed the work which thou haſt given me to do.* v. 6. *I have manifeſted thy name to thoſe thou haſt given me out of the world.* Now as the manifeſting of any part of Gods name is a glorifying him, ſo the *manifeſting* of his *love to the world in giving his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth in him ſhould not periſh but have everlaſting life.* The manifeſting of Chriſt as the only Saviour of the world, the only name given under Heaven by which any can be ſaved, is a moſt eminent glorifying of God, who hath ſet up his reſt in his Son, and deſigned to be exalted in him, and given him a name above every name. Now what is

preach-

preaching but a *manifeſting* of this name of God, a *manifeſting of Chriſt* to men? What are *Miniſters of the Goſpel* but perſons ſpecially deſigned and appointed of God to this work? Every one is bound to *manifeſt Chriſt* in his *ſtation* and *place*; the Miniſters ſtation is not private, he is to preach to a people, to as many as will come to hear; where hath the Goſpel limited him? to ſay he can have no pretence of Conſcience to warrant him to do it, becauſe there is a *Law* againſt it, is to ſay, *That an humane Law to the contrary ought to ſupercede the great end of our creation*; which is a very ſtrange aſſertion.

2. Next to this, *Piety lies in the obeying of the will of God in things which more immediately reſpect his ſervice*, (the obeying the will of God in other things is *probity*.)

The reaſon of this lyes; becauſe in theſe acts of obedience, there is not a meer obedience to God, but there is conjoined with it a *predication of the glory of God*, and a manifeſtation of his name. So that although he that gives *alms to the poor*, or doth an *act of civil juſtice*, if he doth theſe things upon that motive *becauſe God hath commanded* him, *glorifieth God*, becauſe he *doth his will*; yet he that *preacheth*, *prayeth*, *praiſeth*, becauſe God hath commanded him to do theſe things, *glorifieth God* more than he that gives alms, becauſe the latter only glorifieth him by *obeying his will*, the former glorifieth him both by *obeying his will*, and alſo by *predicating* and *publiſhing* to the world, the *infinite grace*, *love*, and other perfections of God. He that doth an *act of juſtice*, if he doth not do it *becauſe God commands him*, doth a reaſonable act, but doth *not gloriſie God at all*. But he that *preacheth the Goſpel*, he that *prayeth* and *praiſeth God*, though he doth not eye the command of God, and ſo ſhall never be re-

warded for what he doth, yet doth an act from whence, *as from the nature of the thing* (whatever design or intention he hath) God is glorified, as his name is manifested and predicated, provided he doth indeed *preach Christ*, and not *prate* an idle story, or a lecture out of *Aristotle*, &c. Now there are many precepts that do oblige Ministers to preach, *Go preach the Gospel to every creature. Go preach and baptize, &c.* If any think those precepts concerned only the Apostles, they will be at a mighty loss to find any *authority* for them to *preach*, or obligation upon people to *hear them*, and they will have no pretence for baptizing, and will not be able to answer that question, *By what authority dost thou these things?* or *who gave thee that authority?* without a transforming themselves into meer *Ministers of men*, from whom alone they must expect their reward. That any humane Law can supercede the obligation of Ministers to *Glorifie God* according to the *station* in which God hath set them, and *by such actions* to which he hath authorized them, and concerning which it is evident that they are such by which above all other he will be glorified, is an assertion very unworthy of so grave and judicious a Divine, as the *Dean* is reputed to be, and I trust will ever approve himself.

But secondly, this *Assertion* appeareth to me as contrary to *charity* as to *piety*, containing what (as the Apostle speaks upon this very occasion, 1 *Thes.* 2. 15.) pleaseth not God, and is *contrary to all men*; not it may be contrary to their *lusts and passions*, but to their *interest* and and true concern. We must now suppose a Minister of the Gospel to be in *Turky*, or *Italy*, or *Spain*, where any one (who hath not the *Atheistical* charity of the *Norfolk Connold*) must believe the generality of souls to be perishing for ever. The Law of God saith, *Thou shalt not*

*hate*

*hate thy brother in thine heart: thou ſhalt in any wiſe rebuke him, and not ſuffer ſin upon him.* The Margent will tell us that according to the *Hebrew* it may as well be tranſlated, *That thou bear not ſin for him,* (חשה may be as well tranſlated, *Suſcipias as feras*). I ſee my neighbour in *Italy*, *Turky*, or *Spain*, ſuppoſe a thouſand ſuch, going down to the *bottomleſs pit*, it is in my power to do ſomething to prevent their *eternal ruin*; I know that if Gods word be true, in that courſe of Religion they are in; may I not tell them ſo? May I not ſhew them the true way of Life and Salvation, becauſe there are Laws in thoſe Countries to the contrary? may then the Law of man ſupercede my obedience to the Law of God, and licenſe me to *hate my brother in my heart*, not rebuking him, but ſuffering ſin upon him; yea, though I venture the taking of his guilt (a ſhare in it I mean) upon my own ſoul? Certainly this is a Poſition not fit to be named amongſt Chriſtians, who believe that all men and women have *Souls*, and that they muſt all *riſe again* at the laſt day, and be adjudged to Heaven or Hell. It is true, in theſe caſes the Miniſter of Chriſt may govern himſelf by Prudence. Chriſt commanded his Diſciples, *Mat. 7. 6. Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither caſt you your pearls before ſwine, leſt they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you.* A Miniſter of Chriſt is not bound to preach the Goſpel to a people who he plainly ſees will ſcoff at it, and deſpiſe it; nor to a people who he ſeeth will but rend and tear him for preaching it. But if in ſuch a Nation there be a people who would gladly hear it if they could, his charity will oblige him to preach it, notwithſtanding any prohibition of man. The *Doctor* goes on.

" And that they are guilty however of *groſs hypocriſie*, " who pretend a further obligation of conſcience in this " matter, I ſhall give this plain *Demonſtration*, which re-

" lies upon conceſſions generally made on all hands, and " by all parties. No Proteſtant, that I know of, holds him- " ſelf obliged to go and preach up his Religion, and to " make Converts in *Spain* or *Italy*; nor do either the *Pro-* " *teſtant* Miniſters, or the *Popiſh Prieſts* think themſelves " bound in Conſcience to preach the Goſpel in *Turky* to " the *Mahometans*. And what is the reaſon? becauſe of " the ſeverity of the Inquiſition in *Popiſh* Countreys, " and of the Laws in *Turky*; but doth the danger then " alter the obligation of Conſcience? no certainly, but " it makes men throw off the falſe pretence and diſguiſe " of it. But where there is a real obligation of Conſci- " ence, dangers ſhould not deter them from their duty, " as it did not the Apoſtles; which ſheweth their caſe to " be different from ours, and that probably this matter " was ſtated right at firſt.

*They who pretend a further obligation*, &c. (Who are they? multitudes of learned, godly Proteſtant Miniſters) are guilty of *hypocriſie*, groſs *hypocriſie* (that is very ſad): but how ſhall it appear? by a *Demonſtration*, and a plain one too! *Demonſtrations* are fine things, eſpecially *plain* ones, ſuch as will *demonſtrate* a thing to any but to him that makes them. What ſhall be the *baſis* of this *Demonſtration? Conceſſions generally made on all hands, and by all parties*; better ſtill! for then we ſhall moſt certainly not deny them (they will be *ex Tripode dicta*). What are thoſe *Conceſſions?* 1. *No Proteſtant holds himſelf obliged to go and preach up his Religion, and to make Converts in* Spain *or* Italy; *nor do either the Proteſtant Miniſters, or Popiſh Prieſts think themſelves bound in conſcience to preach the Goſpel in* Turky *to the* Mahometans. I do not like theſe *Univerſal Particles* in the front of Propoſitions, they ruine their Cauſe, if a ſingle inſtance can be pro-

produced to the contrary. *Spain* and *Italy* are large Territories, and the *Grand Seignors* Dominions are much larger; I cannot tell whether there may not have been some Protestants that have thought themselves obliged in conscience to go and preach the Gospel there. I do know that in *Popish Countries* some have, despising the Inquisition; and in *China* and *Japan* 'tis known what the *Romish Priests* have done. But admit that the generality of Protestants have not thought themselves so obliged: Let that be one *Concession*. Where to find another, I do not know, if it be not in the next words. 2. *And what is the reason? because of the severity of the Inquisition in Popish Countries, and of the Laws in* Turky. This ought not to be call'd a *Concession*, for neither *Protestant* nor *Papists* will assign this as the only reason.

*Protestants* will give the *Doctor* this reason: Because though every *Minister of the Gospel may and ought to preach the Gospel in any place where he is fixed, and whether the Providence of God hath called him; yet every Minister of the Gospel is not bound to traverse the world upon this errand*, as the *Apostles* were, which indeed makes their cause so far different from ours. Now they asserting no more than this, are very unjustly charg'd with *gross hypocrisie*, for pretending an obligation to do it in their places, because they do not go and do it where God hath not fixed them, and to which God hath not sent them. The Doctor ought not to have called this a *Demonstration*, which comes short of a *Topick*.

The charge of *hypocrisie*, *gross hypocrisie*, upon a person, or party, is ordinarily of all other the most *malicious* and *uncharitable charge* that can be; because lying in the *Nonconformity* of the *heart* and *practice*, man hath the most imperfect judgment of it; but withall, it is the most heavy

heavy charge, adjudging persons to the very pit of Hell. —*Give him*, saith God, *his portion with hypocrites, where is weeping and wailing, and gnashing of teeth.* So that it appears that *Hypocrites* have the *first* and *deepest* portion in the bottomless-pit. But withal, it is what is usually said by those that have nothing else to say, and against those against whom men can find nothing else to give them occasion, *except in the law of their God.* But to shut up this discourse.

If Doctor *Tillotson* may charge them, who being *separated to the work of the Ministry, and called of God to it*, with *gross hypocrisie*, because they think themselves obliged to preach the Gospel in the places where the Providence of God hath fixed them, though there be an *Act of Parliament* (and such a *Parliament*) against it, and yet do not think themselves obliged to go and do it in *Turky*, where they have nothing to do, and whither God never sent them; and Mr. *Hickeringell* may call them *Rebels*, *Traytors*, *Villains*, *Cheats*, *Juglers*, *Holdersforth*, *Tauners*, *Snivellers*, *Whiners*, *Bawlers*, *Thumpers*: They are only by the former treated more *Gentelely* and *Courtly*, and by the other more *Boorishly* (according to the *Brutes* education and converse); but they are by them both condemned to the *pit of Hell*, without repentance, and made such evil-doers as the Apostles were, who were adjudged also περικαθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου πάντων περίψημα, *the filth of the world*, and the *off-scouring* of all things, but Βλασφημούμενοι παρακαλοῦμεν. Being thus defamed, we shall intreat. We shall intreat our *Noble Senators* not to believe the *Dictators* of our age, who talk much, but will prove nothing; and intreat our *Countreymen* to judg whose Doctrine, according to Scripture, hath in it most falshood, and whose lives have in them least vice and immoral

immoral wickedneſs. And for *Hypocriſie*, we ſhall intreat God to judg betwixt us and our accuſers (and, *O Lord! how long will it be ere thou ariſeſt to the judgment of thy ſervants?*) And for our Adverſaries alſo, we ſhall intreat God, that their ſin be not laid to their charge; and, *That they may do no evil; not that we ſhould appear approved, but that they may do that which is honeſt, though we be as reprobates: But we truſt that they ſhall know we are no reprobates.*

FINIS.